



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

THE SOUTH'S OPPORTUNITY IN EDUCATION:
THE PROBLEM OF THE APPLICATION
OF STANDARDS

That a great educational awakening exists everywhere in the South is unmistakable. This is evidenced in many ways:

(1) In the work, plans and reports of the several State Superintendents of Education.

(2) In the campaigns for education held in well-nigh every State, the consequent establishment of numerous public high schools, and the strengthening of the entire public school system.

(3) In the generally increased expenditures on State institutions and State education by legislatures.

(4) In the interest aroused in and by the annual meetings of the Conference for Education in the South.

(5) In the gifts to education through the benefactions of Mr. Carnegie, Mr. Rockefeller, the Peabody Board, and others.

(6) In numerous gifts — large and small — by private persons for private as well as for public institutions.

(7) In the promulgation of a system of units of standard by the Carnegie Foundation, and the promises of the extension of the advantages of this Foundation to State institutions.

(8) In the consequent and general publication and raising of standards for entrance.

And (9) we may by no means overlook the existence and quiet but effective work of this Association of Schools and Colleges in the Southern States, now for thirteen years emphasizing the lines of demarcation between school and college.

It is particularly in relation to the last three heads and the application of standards that I wish to address my remarks.

At the outset I ask permission to speak plainly and in entire frankness. I know that you feel that glittering generalities are utterly out of place here, and unworthy of the occasion. It is a concrete actual problem that faces us. We regard ourselves, and ask others to accept us, as educational experts — specialists

called in to diagnose the case of a patient with a disease of very long standing and very evident gravity. I should feel ashamed to talk to you in any other way, having myself no selfish interest to advance, but only wishing the establishment of a scientific educational system — public and private — that may commend itself to intelligent minds whether in our own section or in another, and whether viewed from Europe or from Japan. The best standards for the North are none too good also for the South.

The present educational movement, of which we are a part, has followed two main lines: (1) There has been a public impetus in the nature of wide-spread interest and enthusiasm in things educational; and (2) there has been a private and more personal struggle for efficient standards.

It is wrong to suppose that there is necessarily any lack of sympathy and any contradiction between these two phases of one and the same larger movement. For the greatest efficiency and least waste of energy the close union of the two is eminently desirable in a practicable scheme and sound educational system for the Southern States. There is no inherent contradiction in the universality of interest that may engage every one, and the working out of a system that has for the basis of its distinctions the application of desirable standards. To have any less ideal and practical aim than this last would surely be to deny ourselves the rank of leaders in matters educational. With vast opportunities in our own day we are going to be judged in the future by the right or wrong use we make of them.

The proclamation two years ago of the Carnegie Foundation cleared the atmosphere considerably. It gave a means of appraising educational values the country over. It both measured institutions and forced them to apply the searchlight to these measurements. If institutions were unwittingly deceiving others, at least they could no longer very well deceive themselves — and this was great gain. While the system had hitherto been in use in many places, yet each locality had too far its own particular mode of rating, and this produced confusing results. Here was a common standard readily adopted and easily understood, which commanded attention everywhere. It gave

universality by its very prominence and purpose; consequently everybody became willing to drop his peculiar counting and to estimate in Carnegie units, as all would then understand what was meant. But although the term "Carnegie Units" may be easily adopted, the correct interpretation and application of them are more difficult.

The original limitations of the benefits of the Carnegie Foundation — the exclusion of all institutions having definite relations with either Church or State — at first filled Southern hearts and minds with dismay. For were not virtually all Southern institutions, certainly in their origin, the one or the other? Here again, it was felt, professors in the wealthy institutions of the North and East were getting pensioned, while the poor, hard-worked devils in the South, who had fought all along a discouraging battle, were left to shift for themselves. Mr. Carnegie, perhaps, did not mean it that way, but it was so in effect. Indeed, a professor in a Northern metropolitan institution rather teasingly remarked to me: "We of the East who could best afford to take care of ourselves have merely unloaded on Mr. Carnegie what *we* had been carrying before. You fellows down South are left out in the cold altogether." The partial removal of the bar and the opening of the opportunities to State universities was consequently hailed with delight by friends of education everywhere. True, by a sort of irony of fate there were excluded the two institutions in the Southern States that had been most insistent and consistent about applying standards of entrance, and seemingly the only ones in the South which, in the face of sacrifices, already possessed the requisite fourteen units standard of entrance, when the Carnegie Foundation made its first pronouncement in 1906. But still the men of these two institutions unfeignedly congratulated others that some Southern professors, too, would now gain recognition surely well deserved. And it was hoped that here was provided a ladder by means of which certain hitherto obstructing walls might at last be scaled. In every State the State university was the titular and acknowledged head of the public system of education. The public schools were supposed to look to the State university for guidance and the setting of

proper standards. Now, at last, by reason both of self-interest as well as of right educational theory, the relations of the two could be brought into perfect harmony, the particular line of demarcation between high school and State university could now be made unmistakably plain, and proper standards be rightly pitched and enforced. Surely there would now no longer be any reasonable excuse for a large group of Southern universities not achieving their destiny.

The State universities thus to a very great degree hold the key and command the situation to what will be the future standards of Southern education, and the responsibility upon them is correspondingly great, effectively to apply a generally recognized right theory. I am sincere in believing the opportunity in educational advance in the Southern States exists right here; if properly understood and sincerely and courageously met by those to whom, as the crown of their labors, the opportunity and the obligation have been at length offered. Should opportunism and compromise win the day, and a mere *modus vivendi* be effected, something that looks well on paper — as of immediate and temporary benefit — but offering no genuine reform, then the real battle for a true educational system and for effecting standards is as far removed as ever, and will have to be fought all over again. Then the conferring of the benefits of the Carnegie Foundation — while still going to a body of hard-worked and deserving men — will fail to produce the true moral effects of upholding and supporting the educational standards of our section of the country as we have a right to expect and to exact.

It is the business of the higher education resolutely to lead and not to lag behind, waiting till virtually everything is done for it and circumstances “justify” — such is the expression — this or that step. The university should command the situation, direct and map out the plans that are advisable, and not itself be dictated to.

Educated as I was at both private college and State university, and having taught in both State and private institutions, I feel I have some knowledge and a peculiar right to speak for both sorts of institution. The private schools and academies have largely solved the problem — that is why they exist — be-

cause they have demonstrated that they have and *do* prepare for any desired college in the land. They will always exist, and, I have no doubt, in large numbers, although relatively in proportion to all the schools in the State in an ever increasing minority. State education will develop more and more in an age where the State is being looked to for everything, and is expected to solve every problem and find a nostrum for every ill. It is but another instance of the unconscious trend toward Socialism which we have been witnessing in the utterances and tendencies of the recent political campaign. The problem for the South as a whole, consequently, as for other parts of the Nation, is primarily one of the public schools and an adequate system of public education. This will, almost of necessity, be, as the conduct of the State itself, largely social in its aims and socialistic in its tendencies — more and more devoted in its application to up-building the material resources of the State, and hence growingly industrial in its main features. On the other hand, the private institution will be more individualistic, and seek to express the sentiment of an ideal of culture. Individualism and inherent personality can never entirely disappear in however highly developed a social system, and there will always be found the justification for the private school and college despite all State appropriations and magnificent educational funds. These private institutions, in the nature of things, will naturally be more eclectic, addressing special ends and needs. They will thus probably continue to attain more easily a deeper and richer personality — the very thing aimed at — in their special purposes. For these ends they must maintain at all hazards high standards. For right standards and character are the very breath and life and condition of being in developing personality and individualism. Again, on the other side, the very fact of the universality of application of the State's public educational system should be a convincing argument for the closest allegiance to the standards of a programme previously planned and laid down from stage to stage by experts and supervisors. Both types of institution are really "public," each serving the State and the Nation in its best way, and both interested in the best possible school system.

The public schools in our growing towns boast, and rightly boast, that in the theoretical schedule of studies mapped out they are no whit inferior to the schools of other sections of our country. The test for all schools is merely the matter of putting this schedule, after full experience, into successful application with approved results. More and more of the public schools over the South are saying: Examine our courses, suggest any points of deficiency or weakness that may be improved. We wish to prepare for college with the best. If we do not satisfy the full requirements, show us wherein we fail. I am in receipt constantly of such letters from over the country. This mapping out of the approved academy or high school course — a course of four full years of a right character — is going on everywhere over the land; first in the cities and towns, and gradually extending to the country districts. The whole community — parents, pupils, and teachers — all take pride in this work. No one of them wishes to be deceived. If they have a school doing only one-half or three-quarters work, they sincerely wish to be told it, and they ought to be told so. If they finally work up to four-fourths they are proud of getting these credits, and of announcing and proving the fact to the world. Every community takes pride in developing its school to the highest capacity practicable, and is usually — more often than not — willing to go to extraordinary expense in bringing the school, where its children are being trained, to the required point.

Now, it is obviously confusing and hurtful for any university to accept a one-half or three-fourths school at the rate of a four-fourths one — to keep standards down to meet the conditions of this one-half or three-fourths school. It is all the worse fallacy when done in the name of sympathy for the poor boy. It is hurtful to the university itself that does it, but even more harmful to the educational system which is thereby lamed. Particularly it is deadly to the enlightened ambitious hopes of the community where scholarly aspirations are checked and abused by the very ones who should most naturally be its protectors and guides. I freely admit, where that particular community cannot take care of the further education of the boy, some system must be devised to do so. The boy must be given

the opportunity to become suitably prepared somewhere else in that county or that State, but not at the university. He must be given access to a school which does the last half of the four years' work, or the final fourth, and does prepare fully. That is as simple and as little expensive as transferring him, raw or half-baked, to the State university, and with saving instead of blighting consequences. With the present keen interest in matters educational in every State, and in almost every county, I believe that any alert and efficient State Superintendent of Education would be empowered by any legislature to effect such an arrangement at once; if indeed it needs any additional legislation to put such a plan into practice. Only in some rational way like this can we really have an educational system with proper standards. Only in some rational way like this will the backward school be made aware that it does fail just so far and in what way. Only in some rational way like this can any college and technological institute and university do its own real work in a semblance of self-respect with properly prepared pupils.

Now what the high school course ought to be is pretty generally understood, and with practical uniformity agreed to by educators over the country, and need hardly be outlined here. But, perhaps, it will make some of my statements and illustrations clearer if I tell in a word or two what is the practice in my own department. We demand 15 units for entrance, of which 11 are fixed. The 11 points which are compulsory are, Latin, 4; Mathematics, 3; English, 3; History, at least 1. The remaining 4 units may be chosen from Greek, French, German, Spanish, the Sciences, and additional History. For B.C.E. entrance, the 11 fixed points are: Mathematics, 3; English, 3; History, at least 1, just as for B.A. entrance; but in place of Latin 4, it is Languages 4. The remaining 4 points are again then selected from the various subjects. There is no irregular entrance otherwise. Deficiencies or conditions may not be more than 3 units — that is, no student can enter the College of Arts and Sciences with less than 12 units. If he enters with between 12 and 15 units, approved by a committee, he is still deprived of certain dearly sought student privileges like joining

fraternities, etc., until he has made up the deficiencies and comes up to the full quota. This penalizing, we have found, has served as a powerful incentive for inducing students, when possible, to enter fully prepared. Deficiencies in special subjects must be made up and passed off, and cannot be substituted by other points credited. I have had a student offer as many as 16 or 17 units, and yet be partly deficient, say, in Latin, or some one required subject. The small deficiency cannot be offset by the larger surplusage, but the particular deficiency having been first made up, the surplusage may then possibly be credited to account.

In languages it is believed that a single school year's work, if pursued no further, contains too little experience and knowledge to be worth counting; and language work in Latin, Greek, French, German, Spanish, is only counted when as much as two full school years at least have been successfully accomplished. This often seemingly deprives a pupil of a point, but from experience I believe it a right theory and interpretation.

For students looking forward to technical institutes, wider courses in science, in drawing and in manual training, have been provided in many of the best public schools. We naturally accept a limited amount of science also for entrance upon literary courses. Preparatory courses in drawing and music, while doubtless of great potential culture value, have as yet been too little developed generally in Southern schools to be deemed at present as the best preparation for entrance upon the literary (B.A.) work, and we do not so count them. Nor are military science and tactics, physical culture and gymnasium work, track and field athletics, literary society work and debate, officially at least, recognized anywhere as counting points for entrance; but these interests are regarded, and I think rightly, despite stout asseverations to the contrary in some quarters, merely as natural expression of a healthful, varied school activity.

The Carnegie Foundation rightly makes no distinction, so far as standards are concerned, between the number of units for entrance to college or university, and to a polytechnic institute. The same amount—a minimum of 14—is demanded from all, although in the case of a school of technology these 14

units would naturally be taken more from subjects correlated to those to be pursued in technological work — mathematics, the branches of science, English, history, the modern languages, drawing, shop and wood work, etc. Why, indeed, should there be any the less standards in mathematics, for example, for entrance upon technological work, that is primarily based upon mathematics, than for entrance upon literary courses? For no reason under the sun, save that the technological institutes don't seriously care to enforce it.

The main question is: In any right educational system, what branches should we expect to have taught in the schools and hence should not be taught at all in colleges, technological institutes, and universities? Now the test for every college and university and technological institute is: Where does the work of the lowest class recognized by the institution actually begin? Does it advance clear-cut on the Entrance Requirement in every case, or are there so-called *review* subjects, or are the school subjects actually taught in college *for the sake of those who are not sufficiently prepared*? Let us take instances. Are Elementary Algebra and Geometry school subjects or university subjects? If properly school subjects, are they also taught in the university? If so, why? While Latin is not prescribed for all degrees, and all the Latin may not be demanded for entrance for courses not demanding Latin in themselves, yet if the high school curriculum has been determined upon for four full years, covering Cæsar, Cicero, and Virgil, should the university's lowest class begin where this school course leaves off, or should the university virtually repeat the last school year, so as to reduce the school work to three years and lower at the same time the possibilities of its own work? In any system the answer should not be difficult to find.

At the present moment I am dealing with a not unusual case. A young man comes from a school in the lower South offering 17 units. Upon examination I find the course in Latin, true, covers four years, but does not accomplish the amount of work that is expected in a full four year's course. Virgil is lacking; the young man, has therefore, been rated deficient in Latin. He has complained, but the Professor of Latin is convinced that the

Latin course of his school is deficient. I have always decided similar cases in this way, nor can I see the justification for a reversal of opinion.

I received last spring a letter from a mother stating that her son had a certificate from the schools of her city, entitling him to complete entrance in the university of that State, and asking whether I would also accept it. I replied that so far as it covered our conditions of entrance I thought I could do so; so far as it did not, the deficiencies would have to be made up, and I suggested that the summer vacation might profitably be used for this. Upon examining the details I found that Virgil was lacking, and there were thus only three units in Latin instead of four, and solid geometry was missing, another half point — granting that all the rest of the work had been satisfactory. Whatever the number of units besides, with us, as said, these particular subjects are imperatively demanded, and must be satisfactorily passed. Our college does not offer classes in these subjects, but the work of the Freshman class presupposes these courses, and is based upon them. I must, therefore, insist in the matter of standards of a Freshman class, it is not a matter of any 14 or 15 units counted anyway; it is a question of what particular 14 or 15 units are preparatory for definite work to be pursued further in the college years. Anything else were unworthy of the name of educational system.

As an English teacher I may also add that it is unreasonable to suppose that a student has fulfilled the requirements and is prepared in English when he is in arrears on advanced school subjects like mathematics and Latin. Weakness in these, I have found, invariably reveals weakness in the one or two branches the pupil is supposed to have passed. Tell me where the boy is in mathematics and language work, and it is not very difficult to decide where he is apt to be in his English studies, too. This is why, I fancy, professors in scientific courses in universities, not demanding of pupils the full quota of mathematics and preliminary language work, whether Latin or not, find their pupils, while nominally passed, often wretchedly deficient in the foundations of English speech.

The subjects of Greek, modern languages, and the sciences,

are on a somewhat different basis. No one of these is altogether obligatory for entrance — *i. e.*, courses with 14 units can be, and necessarily are, made up without including all of these. If one has had the required Greek, usually he has not had the modern languages; if modern languages, usually he has not had Greek, etc. In these cases it is understood that such students may and do begin in college these other new studies (which they have not previously had, although fully prepared). But there is this proviso — which may not be overlooked — if such course is counted for entrance it cannot also count toward a degree. I give a common illustration: In the same beginning French or German class, a university may have two brothers. With one this French or German is a deficiency, or former failure on which he has been conditioned; and in that case the French or German may not count for his degree until he gets into an advanced class. With his fellow who entered, let us say, on Greek, meeting the requirements fully, this first class in French or German is new or additional work, and so can count toward his degree. I fear many institutions rigidly enforce no such distinction, and the former of the two supposed students, once admitted, argues that he has been in the same class with his fellow, and if he passes he has done just so much work at the university, and is entitled to a point on his degree like his fully-prepared brother. Indeed, I have had a student make that argument and feel that he was unjustly treated, though he had come in deficient in two points, *viz.*, on this one subject, French. Though members of the same class, in one case it was work to supply a deficiency; in the other it was a *bona fide* Freshman point.

If a student is deficient, he must be responsible for the deficiency, otherwise very unequal Bachelor's degrees would be awarded by the institution. And many institutions apparently consent to this, or fail as patently in another way. If the lowest college class is pitched below the full requirements in certain important subjects like Latin, mathematics, and English, a boy entering on the normal full requirements actually gets advanced standing, and practically is admitted to the Sophomore class. And so he really gets his Bachelor's degree on a three-year's

course instead of the ostensible four-year's one. Obviously such a degree is in so far a cheap degree. Based on the 14 or 15 points of right character for entrance, there should still be the four full years' college course for the Bachelor's degree—whether B.A. or B.Sc. But too many institutions have really only three-year courses, judged by manifest standards. An institution, the entrance into whose Freshman class demands only 10 units, is virtually one year behind normal requirements, and one whose entrance is 6 units, practically two years in arrears. I have had more than one of the latter cases to deal with in the case of transfers, and it is always a regrettable and disagreeable duty to make this apparent. I read the other day the statistics of the new students entering a reputable college in Virginia. About fifty per cent had entered the Sophomore class, and the other fifty per cent were admitted as Freshmen. It takes but little educational acumen and experience to know that only about fifty per cent were really prepared for college work, and these instead of being Sophomores should have constituted the Freshman class.

I take one other illustration from a recent personal experience. The summer of 1907 the student of a large Southern university called on me and introduced himself. He was visiting Sewanee, was pleased with it, he said, and was thinking of transferring. He told me that he had graduated from his home school in 1906, completing the required course. He had gone to the university of his State with his school diploma, and had been admitted to the Sophomore class. This work he had just done, and consequently was within two years of his Bachelor's degree at that institution. I told him his school work would be cordially recognized as entrance work, and his past year's work would also be duly credited. But it was clearly work of only Freshman character, and that having completed his one college year he would have still three year's work to complete before he could get the Bachelor's degree. He admitted frankly that he thought this was just and right, thanked me profusely, and returned to his home institution.

It is not hard to determine where the work of a Freshman class should begin. The whole problem lies in rightly discern-

ing and unmistakably applying the dividing line between school work and college work, and standing rigidly by it. The university should say unequivocally to the schools: Yours is the duty of preparing, and of sending only after you have prepared. Your diploma must mean this. To say that the public schools cannot accomplish this is to indict the whole system and its supporters, and declare it a pretense and a sham. It is not to be so indicted; but the system is to be, and can be made a reality. Good schools are furnished by the State in an ever-increasing number, and the State can in its school system prepare for college; if not at one place, then at another. And no college, technological institute, or university in any system fostered and planned by the State, has any place for or should accept any young man until he has so completed a full course in such academy or high school, and is fully prepared; least of all, for the purpose of playing ball, and for other designs than legitimate college work.

The law steps in and determines the length of time and nature of preparation for the practice of medicine. If not the law, certainly an intelligent public opinion with all the force of law expressed in the will of an expert educational board or other authority, should determine who have rightly completed the preparatory course, and who are entitled to apply for admission to technical institute or university. And this will, by force of the same public opinion, if not of law, likewise include the professional departments, Law and Medicine. These two in a right system should already to-day be rigidly demanding at the least the 14 units of the completed academy or high school course, and in a short time it should be even more, as already with better institutions. To have the Law, Medical, Theological, or other departments of an institution the refuge of certain youths who cannot pass the required College Entrance Examinations is little short of scandalous. It has also been an uplifting influence to emphasize the 14 units for eligibility on athletic teams where properly conceived and consistently upheld.

Under any proper system, parents would learn intelligently to look after their son's preparation, as they commonly do where a system prevails, calculating far ahead, even several years, just

when their son may be expected to enter college, and when to graduate, following attentively each stage of the educational process. If they do not now, but disastrously change from school to school in the hope of pushing the lad through sooner and more easily, how far is it because we ourselves — claiming to be educational experts — are not clear and insistent as to what is required, and thus really lend encouragement to, and are primarily responsible for, all sorts of makeshifts and compromises?

I make, therefore, the urgent appeal which I must believe the faculties of our best institutions will of themselves heed. Let the Southern States grasp the opportunities and benefits of the Carnegie Foundation for their State universities, and at the same time make it the happy means of a revolution in the universal application of educational standards.

As already intimated, it is not a matter of *any* 14 units counted somehow or other, even if that should be allowed, but of a particular fourteen of definite scope and positive character. Merely to have nominal standards on paper which are not applied in spirit and in fact, would be meaningless. There is need of a requirement that no institution can accept the Carnegie Foundation terms that is not in a position to enforce them rigidly and make their application vital — else it would but tend to confuse. It is better to state frankly — as some have already done — We are not yet quite ready, and we say we are not. We *can* be in two, in three, in five years, but not this year. The faculties, the students, the public would know just what was enforced, what were the actual standards of entrance, and how much yet remained to be done. With this perfect frankness I sincerely believe that faculties, school men, parents, and citizens would unite to remedy such a condition in any community and State in a minimum amount of time. The trouble usually has been that the true status is often obscured — teachers, pupils, parents are not clear as to drawing the line, and loose conditions prevail. No community, no teacher, no parent, no pupil but is proud in coming up to high standards. The fault lies in the standard enforced. They have neither been properly presented nor insisted on. I have yet to meet the school man who did not wish, despite all discouragements, to

make his school the best possible school, to turn out boys who were capable and fit, and do all that parents and higher authorities expected and insisted upon. The class and profession of teachers with us in the South is still an ambitious and a proud one — thank heaven! But if the universities, as the highest institutions of learning in the educational system, do not show him resolutely the proper aims and standards, and support him in his work, pray who will do so? I make my appeal, consequently, to the State and higher institutions of every character.

I am not directly concerned in applying standards for the Carnegie Foundation and determining who are fit. That is the task of Dr. Pritchett and his intelligent organization. But I have been assured by prospective candidates that you can secure 14 units and get on the Foundation, and yet be a year behind in Latin and Mathematics, and possibly other important branches. Indeed, some one once obligingly offered, pencil in hand, to demonstrate to me mathematically how one could really be a whole school year behind in vital subjects and yet have 14 units on miscellaneous studies. I was not interested in that phase of the subject, and declined to be instructed, yet I hear it reiterated that an institution feels itself justified in claiming membership and still not demanding Virgil for Freshman Latin; in receiving the accompanying honors and lacking geometry in its Freshman class; in being defective in writing and command of English and knowledge of literature, and making up any or all of these deficiencies by physical geography, physiology, carpentering, and what not. I am not shouldering any of the Carnegie Foundation burdens, and I leave these problems entirely to its capable shoulders. But I do plead earnestly as a Southerner who is giving his life to the cause of Southern education and Southern ideals, in the name of the splendid educational opportunity and crying needs of the Southern States, that no institution permit itself such an interpretation of rules, even if it were possible. How can we expect to get the schools to the point of preparing pupils fully and adequately if we permit their higher class work to be offset by a multiplicity of units on various subjects somewhere else, many of which may be of relatively low grade and of doubtful value? Fewer subjects well taught

and developed afford better preparation than odds and ends collected from every corner and pieced together. From such a state of nominal standards inadequately applied, the South would have little to hope for in perfecting an educational system, and the gravest problem facing us would be as far from solution as ever.

I have often had prospective students to whom I was compelled to refuse admittance, say calmly: "Very well, we will go to another university where the same number of units does not hold, and enter the Freshman class there." They refuse to go any longer to school when they can play men and get in college, and they go. I have more than once been told by an applicant I rejected, "I can go to such and such an institution (which is on the Carnegie Foundation) and be admitted." I have never been willing to believe it was so, nor do I. A few weeks ago, this past September, I had an applicant who, upon examination, mustered $10\frac{1}{2}$ units, and who was refused entrance — he being $4\frac{1}{2}$ units behind the normal entrance requirements — really the deficiency of a whole school year. He stated confidently that he could enter a Carnegie Foundation institution, and went off on the train with a railway ticket purchased for it. I was in no way surprised to learn that the Entrance Committee of that institution sent him to one of the excellent schools in their city to become fully prepared — where I know by personal examination the bright and promising lad rightly belongs.

But I am told, You are not democratic, and have no regard for the poor country boy without opportunities. On the contrary, I plead for the opportunity to be given the poorest country boy by the State — but at some school — and not at the specialized technological institute and university, until he is really prepared for their courses. As I have already said, each State has plenty of schools sufficiently advanced to prepare for college, and a system can readily be devised whereby the lad without home advantages can go on with his education. But not until thus prepared should he be permitted through any false sentiment to pass to the highest institutions of all, which is to award titled degrees upon the completion of a real four year's course. This ideal is not chimerical. It is the practical problem for

sober, right-minded educators to face and see it solved right. I have the faith it can be so solved, and it is for this I make my appeal.

For who, after all, is the real friend of the poor boy? Who cherishes the real democratic ideals of education? The one who depresses so-called university standards down to the uneducated poor boy's level, or the one who insists that he be lifted up to the higher plane and helps create a public sentiment and opinion for that agency? The one who retards the right sort of school being established for him in his own community by yielding to low standards of entrance, or the one who declares that the right sort of school must be established, and points the way by announcing and enforcing the proper standards himself that would help toward this? Only by upholding proper college entrance standards can you encourage and expect a community to build up a school commensurate therewith. The real friend of the poor boy, and the one actually promoting democratic ideals in education is, therefore, that institution that insists on the locality building up a good home school for everybody, and encourages and protects that home school by not robbing it of the boy until prepared for efficient higher work elsewhere. There is not a strong community or a strong county to-day that cannot have a good school if it will. Our higher institutions of learning are among the chief causes at fault if anywhere none such now exist. After years of agitation we should be heartily sick of pretense, and ask only for the reality. The South's opportunity in education, as I see it, and it is a glorious one, is merely one of wisely mapping out a sound educational system and consistently and courageously applying its standards.

JOHN BELL HENNEMAN.

The University of the South.